FORRESTERS

Clear direction

Life Sciences UPDATE

Recent News I Summer 2016

Preparing for the new Patent Box scheme

A new Patent Box scheme is due to commence on 1 July 2016 and, for some businesses, the new scheme will not offer the same generous corporation tax relief as the current scheme.

Current Patent Box scheme

The current Patent Box scheme has been running since April 2013, providing a significant corporation tax reduction on worldwide profits attributed to inventions patented in the UK and other qualifying IP rights. The reduction is being phased in gradually, with the lowest 10% corporation tax rate applicable from 2017 onwards.

The current scheme will continue alongside the new scheme until 30 June 2021, but only for patents that have been applied for or granted by **30 June 2016** and elected into the current scheme.

A company must file an election into the current scheme at HM Revenue and Customs within two years from the end of the company's accounting period. The deadline for electing patents into the current scheme for the 2016 accounting period is therefore not until 2018.

A company can elect out of the Patent Box scheme but it will be barred for five years from re-entering the scheme.

What is changing?

The scheme is being revised following concerns that it might be misused by businesses to unfairly reduce their tax payments. The main change is the addition of a "modified nexus fraction" to the calculation, which will reduce the tax relief available to businesses that do not carry out R&D in the UK or do not outsource their R&D to companies based in the UK.

Which businesses will be affected?

- Businesses that do not carry out or outsource their R&D within the UK will be affected by the switch to the new Patent Box scheme.
    - These businesses are likely to be better off electing into the current scheme, which is not dependent on whether or not R&D is carried out in the UK.
- Businesses that carry out or outsource their R&D within the UK are less likely to be affected by the switch to the new scheme.
    - It may still be beneficial for these businesses to elect patents into the current scheme to avoid (until 2021) the administrative burden of tracking UK R&D spend that is required under the new scheme.
- Some businesses with high operating costs and already low corporation tax payments may be better off not using the Patent Box at all.
    - Patent Box calculations can, in rare cases, lead to an increase in corporation tax payments. Other forms of relief such as R&D tax credits are likely to be better suited to these businesses.

Action points

We recommend that UK companies:

- File any new UK patent applications before **30 June 2016** to benefit from the current scheme – new applications filed after this date cannot be elected into the current scheme.
- Consider whether to elect qualifying patents into the current scheme before the 2018 election deadline (two years after the end of the company's 2016 accounting period).
- Consider moving their R&D to the UK or outsourcing their R&D to a company based in the UK to maximise the corporation tax reduction available under the new scheme.

This article provides an overview of the changes to the Patent Box scheme. Patent Box calculations are complex and professional advice should be obtained from a regulated tax advisor before taking any action.

If you have any questions or if you need any further information, please contact Dan Rusby-Gale or your patent attorney at Forresters.

Dan Rusby-Gale

T99/13 from the European patent office Boards of Appeal

http://www.epo.org/law-practice/case-law-appeals/recent/t130099eu1.html, published on 25 April 2016.

Background

The granted European patent was opposed by 10 parties, and the patent was revoked during opposition proceedings due to alleged added subject matter. The granted claims referred to a kinematic viscosity of a liquid formulation and included the feature that viscosity was measured "at 25 degrees C". The opponents successfully argued that inclusion of the temperature added matter as compared to the application as filed, because a combination of the kinematic viscosity with the temperature was not directly and unambiguously disclosed in the original application (indeed, the claims as filed did not include this feature – the temperature was added to overcome a clarity objection).

The appeal

The Board of Appeal reversed the decision of the opposition division: the Board decided that the measurement condition of 25 degrees C was unambiguously disclosed. This was because all of the examples in the patent except one measured the viscosity at 25 degrees C. Furthermore there was a statement in the description that the inventive composition should be reconstituted at 25 degrees C. The only example which used a different temperature was anyway not in accordance with the invention. The skilled person would recognise from the original disclosure that 25 degrees C was the intended measurement temperature and the added matter objection was therefore set aside.

Practice notes

It is well known that the EPO has a strict standard for assessing added matter, and the test is a subjective one; my personal view is that the patentee was fairly lucky to escape this situation. Extracting values from the examples is usually the last resort. However this case seems to support the view that the Boards of Appeal take a more pragmatic approach to assessing added matter – taking into account what the skilled person would understand from the patent, rather than only what is printed on the page.

The situation arose because the patentee (then applicant) was forced, due to a clarity objection, to include a measurement temperature. The viscosity value was deemed unclear without a temperature, because viscosity is highly dependent on temperature. To avoid this, when drafting applications which will end up in Europe I advise including measurement conditions wherever possible, e.g. temperature when the property is temperature-dependent, like viscosity. Also the method of measurement should be included if the measured value is dependent on the technique used, e.g. gel permeation chromatography (GPC) for polymer molecular weight or dynamic light scattering (DLS) for particle size.

Nevertheless if this kind of added matter objection arises it may be possible to amend the claims taking a value from the examples, on the basis of this decision, if the circumstances are similar.

Dr Matt Barton

When is a "non-therapeutic" method therapeutic?

Background

Methods of treatment by surgery or therapy are excluded from patentability by the European Patent Convention (EPC) for policy reasons; so that medical professionals are free to carry out surgical and therapeutic interventions without the possibility of patent infringement.

It is possible to obtain patent protection to non-therapeutic methods.

It is also possible to obtain patent protection to therapeutically active compounds or compositions for use in a therapeutic method. The term "for use" in this context makes such a claim a purpose limited compound or composition claim.

T 2451/13

The patent

European Patent No. 1981360 was granted with a claim reading (emphasis added), "A non-therapeutic method for sensoric imprinting of different tastes in an infant, comprising the steps of administering… [different portions of food products]."

Sensoric imprinting was summarised as, "The exposure, e.g. administering or feeding, of infants to different plant materials, particularly from vegetable or fruit, results in the sensoric imprinting of the different tastes. Children and adults having been subjected to this process of sensoric imprinting when they were young, ingest more fruit and vegetables, resulting in an improved health."

Opposition

The patent was opposed on the grounds of lack of novelty and inventive step. During opposition (i.e. after the nine month opposition period), the opponent raised a new ground arguing that the "non-therapeutic method" claim was excluded from protection because it relates to a therapeutic method. The patent was revoked after opposition.

Appeal

Admission of new ground

The EPO Board of Appeal found that it was permissible for the opponent to raise the new ground after the opposition period because in the interim a new Board of Appeal decision (T 1635/09) issued which made this a valid ground for opposition.

"Non-therapeutic" disclaimer

The Board noted that the patent said sensoric imprinting can prevent an infant from acquiring a dislike for the taste of vegetables in later life, resulting in a healthier lifestyle and preventing health problems. Therefore, the method claim was inextricably linked to disease prevention. The "non-therapeutic method" claim was found invalid as relating to a therapeutic method and the disclaimer did not assist the patentee.

Standard of evidence: "Up to the hilt"

Another issue considered by the Board was whether or not a prior art document was available at the priority date.

The patentee questioned whether or not a document cited by the opponent was available at the priority date. During the appeal, the opponent filed a further document corroborating the availability of the document. The newly filed document was allowed into proceedings (despite it not being filed with the opposition) because the Board believed it helped to establish the availability of the earlier cited document.

The newly filed document included a date four years prior to the priority date of the application. The patentee argued that the date printed on the document did not confirm "up to the hilt" that the document was available on that date.

The Board concluded that "up to the hilt" should be equated with "beyond reasonable doubt", rather than "absolute certainty". The Board found that, as the relevant document addressed parents and gave them instructions on how to feed children, it would not have been locked away. Therefore, given the four year difference, it was available to the public before the priority date and citable as prior art.

Ultimately, the appeal was unsuccessful and the patent was revoked.

Chris Bond

Has the EPO relaxed the burden on opponents for sufficiency of disclosure?

A recent decision, T0061/14, of the EPO technical boards of appeal suggests that the EPO may have relaxed the burden of proof on opponents for sufficiency of disclosure objections.

Background

In Europe, the claims of a patent must be sufficiently disclosed, meaning that the patent must contain enough information for someone working in the field of the invention to be able to carry out the invention taking into account their expert knowledge. It is established practice that an opponent raising an objection that claims lack sufficient disclosure must show that there are **serious doubts** about whether the claimed invention could be carried out by the skilled person, and must substantiate their objection with **verifiable facts**. This a high burden of proof. In practice, this generally means providing experimental evidence or expert declarations to show that it is not possible for a skilled person to carry out the invention.

European patent no. 1986706 was opposed after grant. The patent related to an embolization particle, wherein *inter alia* at least 20% of the pores in the interior of the particle are interconnected. The opposition division revoked the patent because the invention was found to be insufficiently disclosed. The patentee filed an appeal against this decision.

The appeal

The opponent successfully argued that the patent did not sufficiently disclose how to determine the percentage of pores of an embolization particle which are interconnected. The patentee argued that the methodology for determining the percentage of interconnected pores was well-known and filed multiple documents to support this. The opponent did not file any evidence to show that the claimed particle could not be obtained. Nevertheless, the appeal board sided with the opponent, stating that *"in the present case the respondent [i.e. the opponent] raised serious doubts in the form of comprehensible and plausible arguments regarding the lack of information in the patent"*. The appeal was dismissed.

Take-home lessons

This decision suggests that an opponent need not provide any evidence to support a lack of sufficiency objection, provided that they give comprehensive and plausible arguments. This is a much lower burden of proof than before. Following this decision, patentees may therefore find that the burden of proof is more readily shifted onto them to prove that the invention is sufficiently disclosed. This can be difficult to prove as the patentee found in the present case. It is too soon to tell whether this decision signifies a change in how the EPO approaches sufficiency of disclosure, but in the meantime, it would be prudent for patentees to include as much information as possible about how to perform the invention when drafting their applications to avoid having to provide evidence after grant.

Charlotte Fox

Can't Get There From Here Sufficiency of Disclosure at the EPO

Generally, the ground of opposition to a European patent that is most easy to defend is sufficiency of disclosure (Article 83 EPC). In most cases, the attacked patent contains an example of carrying out the invention. Any party wanting to invalidate such a patent usually has to provide proof that it does not work.

This traditional way of invalidating a patent for sufficiency of disclosure – proving that the invention does not work – has recently been joined by two new approaches. These are to attack inconsistent measurement of a claimed parameter, and to question the availability of a starting material in a manufacturing method.

The attack on measurement of a claimed parameter relies on there being multiple ways of measuring that parameter, which different ways give significantly different results. The practice started from attacking unusual parameters, rarely seen in the art, but has recently extended to attacking well known parameters, such as viscosity. Unless the patent specifically teaches a method of measuring a claimed parameter, it is vulnerable to such an attack.

A sufficiency of disclosure attack, based on non-availability of a starting material, is less common. It can be problematic in the field of biologically-based inventions. This was highlighted by a recent opposition decision, revoking European Patent EP1962578. Although such an decision is not as influential as a decision of the Boards of Appeal, this case is a useful illustration of how sufficiency of disclosure of biologically based inventions can be vulnerable due to the apparent non-availability of the starting material.

The patent was directed to melon plants which carried the genetic trait of being resistant to a particular virus. The melon was descended from parent seeds by crossing. Those parent seeds were known in the art, and were deposited in 1961.

The patent did not structurally define the gene carrying the resistance. Instead, the claim defined the gene by the function - conveying resistance against the virus - and an associated genetic marker. The claim also required that the plant homozygous for the trait. The patentee owners did not make seeds of their claimed melons public accessible by deposit.

The opponents first argued that the seeds of the parent strain, or known crosses, inevitably contained seeds which were homozygous for the relevant trait, and so anticipated the claimed invention.

The patentee argued reasonable doubt that those seeds contained any individual seed homozygous for the resistance trait. The patentee also argued that, in melons, a gene may not be maintained in a population unless it is specifically selected for inbreeding processes, which was not the case in any of the known crosses.

The opposition division agreed with the patentee, that the parent seeds did not necessarily include one homozygous for the trait, although they must have contained heterozygous for the trait. Known crosses were not carried out to select for the trait, so there was also no guarantee that any of those plants were homozygous for it.

Unfortunately this was a temporary victory for the patentee, whose arguments rebounded in the discussion on sufficiency of disclosure.

The opposition division agreed with the opponents that the invention was not sufficiently disclosed.

The opposition division decided that the skilled person could not reliably reproduce the claimed plants of the present invention using material publically available before the filing date, in particular, the parent seeds.

The opposition division noted that the patentee had argued that the parent seeds of could not be certain to contain any homozygous seed. The patentee had also confirmed that such seeds can lose traits by genetic drift.

The opposition division decided that the originally deposited parent seed was still viable for the resistance trait.

Concluding, the opposition division decided that it was far from certain that the originally deposited parent seeds would contain the relevant trait.

There was enough evidence to cast doubt on the sufficiency of the patent teaching. It was then down to the patentee to show that, at the relevant date and despite these concerns, the skilled person would have reliable access to a starting material which would reliably give rise to the claimed plants. The patentee was unable to do so.

The opposition division revoked the patent because the claimed plant was not reproducible in any reliable way. The starting material - the seed heterozygous for the resistance trait - was not reliably available.

The clear lesson from this case is that, where the invention lies in complex biologically material which the patent does not structurally defined so it can be artificially manufactured, the patentee must deposit the relevant material – certainly any claimed product, and ideally the starting material as well.

The patentee should make the deposit and refer to it in the application on filing –the EPO will not allow an applicant to add that information later.

Jon Gowshall

Court of Justice of the EU (CJEU) confirms orphan drug market exclusivity for Glivec®

The CJEU, the highest court in Europe, has found that the European Medicines Agency (EMA) was correct to reject Teva's generic drug application for Glivec® for certain indications on the basis of orphan drug exclusivity of a similar medicinal product, Tasigna®, not the orphan drug exclusivity of the reference product Glivec®.

This is an unusual decision, but is binding on the EU member states. The finding is unexpected because the CJEU interpreted the underlying orphan drug regulation by looking beyond the literal wording of the regulation and instead looking at the purpose behind the regulation. This is the so-called "teleological" approach, which the CJEU is famed for using when interpreting European regulations, as seen by the case law the court has develop in the field of Supplementary Protection Certificates (patent term extensions for pharmaceuticals in Europe).

The decision is seen in some spheres as being in favour of the brand drug companies and could allow them to extend their market monopoly substantially for their first orphan product using similar follow on orphan product authorisations.

Background

The orphan drug regulation aims to incentivise research into developing treatment or a cure for rare medical conditions or disorders. Without such legislation pharmaceutical companies would be quite reluctant to develop and market orphan products as the returns would rarely justify the necessary investments. As a particular incentive, the developer is rewarded with a market exclusivity period when an orphan marketing authorisation is granted. This market exclusivity protects the orphan medicinal product from market competition with the same or similar products for the same indication for 10 years from the date of first marketing authorisation.

During this exclusivity period no other "similar medicinal product" will be accepted for approval for the same indication unless one of the three exemptions applies: the consent from the first marketing authorisation holder, insufficient supply of the medicinal product or clinical superiority.

In 2001, Glivec® (imatinib mesylate) received marketing authorisation as an orphan medicinal product for treating chronic myeloid leukaemia (CML). Glivec® therefore enjoyed a market exclusivity period until 2011.

In 2007, Novartis, the holder of the marketing authorisation for Glivec® applied for a marketing authorisation for a similar orphan medicinal product Tasigna® (nilotimib) also for treating CML. Even though this was filed during the market exclusivity period for Glivec®, which would normally prevent the authorisation of a similar product, the holder of the marketing authorisation for Glivec® (being the same party) gave its consent for the second authorisation.

In 2012, Teva applied for a marketing authorisation for a generic version of Glivec® since its 10 year market exclusivity period had expired.

However, Teva's application was rejected due to the finding that the market exclusivity period for Tasigna® was still running.

The arguments

Teva ran three main arguments:

1. Similar orphan drugs should not benefit from the same exclusivity period as the first orphan product;

2. If a similar orphan drug is allowed a 10 year exclusivity period, then this may allow the first orphan product to enjoy up to 20 years of market exclusivity. This would create a system of evergreening, giving companies an incentive to develop a series of similar orphan products, to push out the length of market exclusivity beyond 10 years for the initial product. Instead, the similar orphan drug should share the exclusivity period with the first orphan product;

3. Even if a similar orphan product is granted its own 10 year exclusivity period, it should only preclude the authorisation for marketing of products that are similar to the second orphan product, and should not prevent the authorisation of products similar to the first orphan product after the exclusivity period for the first orphan product has expired.

The decision

The CJEU dismissed Teva's three grounds of appeal for the following reasons:

1. The orphan drug regulation does not contain any provision precluding the grant of a 10 year market exclusivity period of its own for similar orphan medicinal products. The CJEU found that this was in line with the objectives of the regulation which are that market exclusivity must be granted in all cases in which an orphan product has been given a marketing authorisation in order to incentive research in this area;

2. The CJEU found that the market exclusivity attached to the first orphan product, at least formally, will not be extended as a result of the fact a second marketing authorisation is granted for a similar product. Likewise, the market exclusivity period of a later similar orphan product should not be curtailed by the existence of an earlier marketing authorisation for an orphan medicinal product;

3. The CJEU found that a marketing authorisation can be refused for a similar orphan product in respect of therapeutic indications for which an orphan product has been authorised and for which it enjoys market exclusivity. Thus, market exclusivity attaches to that orphan product for the relevant therapeutic indications, irrespective of the fact that the orphan product in question was granted by virtue of being similar to another orphan product that has itself been granted marketing authorisation. The fact that the therapeutic indications for which both orphan products received marketing authorisation are similar, does not mean that each cannot have its own market exclusivity for those therapeutic indications.

Charlotte Teall

Toxic Divisionals EBA Question

In June we updated you on the "toxic divisionals" quandary at the EPO. That piece can be found here: *http://www.forresters.co.uk/news-and-events/news/ip-updates/june-2015-an-antidote-to-toxic-divisionals/.*

The Board of Appeal (BoA) mentioned at the end of that piece has now formally referred five questions to the Enlarged Board of Appeal (EBA), for a decision on this legal point.

The decision is lengthy, mostly taken up with a review of the law to date.

BoAs can sometimes overcomplicate issues that they hand to the EBA, which can result in a less than satisfactory EBA decision.

In this case, the BoA asks very clear questions. Pleasingly, it does not restrict its questions to toxic divisionals, but asks for guidance on the more general point of whether a claim can have partial priority even if it does not contain clear alternatives (an "or" clause).

The fifth question addresses the issue of whether a divisional application may be cited as prior art against its own parent, orvice versa. By drafting the question so specifically, the BoA ensures that the controversy over the last few years must be addressed by the EBA.

We await the EBA decision with interest. The EBA has only just taken responsibility and it is too early to tell if it will expedite the procedure. In the meantime, if you have your divisional application cited against your parent application, orvice versa, you can consider requesting suspension of the EPO proceedings until the EBA decides this important legal point.

Jon Gowshall

EPO fee increases - 1 April 2016

The EPO announced increases to some official fees with effect from 1 April 2016 - see The EPO Fee Increase Announcement here: http://www.epo.org/law-practice/legal-texts/official-journal/2016/01/a3/2016-a3.pdf Some fees have not changed at all - the maximum increase is under 2%.

We can achieve some small savings by paying scheduled renewal fees due only in April, May and June 2016 before the introduction of the new fees on 1st April 2016.

Please contact us if you want to take advantage of the lower official fees due in this period.

To see a comparison between some of the more common official fees, please refer to: http://www.forresters.co.uk/media/215933/epo_fee_increases_from_1_april_2016_-_ldh_-_feb_2016.pdf

Lloyd Hoarton

10 things you should know about the recent EU Trade Mark Reform

1. New terminology

The term European Community has been replaced by European Union (“EU”). Therefore, the Community trade mark is now the EU trade mark. In addition, the Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market has been renamed as the EU Intellectual Property Office (“EU IPO”).

2. Fees

The fee structure for applications has changed from coverage of up to three classes to a one-fee-per-class-system. Renewal fees and fees for cancellation actions have been reduced.

3. Art 28 declarations

Trade marks filed before 22 June 2012, which cover class headings in the specification can be amended by notification to the EU IPO that the registration is intended to cover goods and services beyond the literal meaning of the class heading. The deadline for filing the declaration is 24 September 2016.

4. Graphical representation

A graphical representation is no longer required. This may make it easier to register unusual trade marks. However, the sign still needs to be “represented in a manner which enables the competent authorities and public to determine the clear and precise subject matter of the protection afforded to the proprietor”.

5. Renewal deadlines

Renewals of EU trade marks must now be requested by the date of expiry and not by the end of the month in which the expiry occurs.

6. Opposition period for IR (EU)

An EU designation under an IR will now proceed more quickly. The opposition period will start one month after publication of the designation details rather than six months, as was previously the case.

7. Designations of origin/geographical indications

Designations of origin and geographical indications can now form a basis for refusal or invalidity on both absolute grounds and relative grounds.

8. Own name defence

Businesses can no longer use the own name defence (only applies to individuals). The use of a trade mark as a company name may amount to infringement and company name watching becomes more important.

9. Counterfeit goods

Counterfeitgoods in transit through the EU can be stopped if the goods (or packaging) bear a mark identical to the owners mark or a sign. However, there is a defence if the owner of the goods can show that the owner of the mark is not entitled to prevent the goods being placed on the market in their final destination.

10. Certification marks

In the fullness of time there will be provision for the registration of EU certification marks.

Janette Hamer

New Costs Cap Relating To UK Fast Track Opposition Process

On 1 October 2013 the UK IPO introduced a Fast Track Opposition process relating to trade marks. The purpose of the new process was to provide SMEs with a quicker, cheaper means of enforcing their registered trade marks against later filed applications to register conflicting marks. In the first twelve months around 7% of oppositions filed at the UK IPO, 139 in total, were filed using the Fast Track process. Further, 232 Fast Track oppositions were filed between 1 October 2014 and 31 April 2015 bringing the percentage of oppositions using the Fast Track route up to around 10%.

The Office issued decisions in around 15% of Fast Track opposition cases, the rest of the cases result in withdrawal of the trade mark (around 60%) and withdrawal of the opposition (around 25%) (sometimes withdrawal occurs after an amendment has been made to the scope of protection requested by the applicant).

The figures relating to the outcome of Fast Track oppositions are comparable to regular opposition proceedings filed at the UK IPO. That said, the time taken to issue the decision relating to a Fast Track opposition is much less than the time taken to issue a decision resulting from a Regular opposition. In fact the average time taken is 3 months from the filing of the defence (and ranges usually from 1 to 7 months). Further, the average costs awarded in a Fast Track opposition is around £460 which compares favourably to the average costs award of £1235 relating to Regular opposition proceedings.

Since the potential for a costs award being made against a losing party is likely to act as a disincentive to SMEs who wish to bring or defend opposition proceedings, the UK IPO has introduced a cost cap. The new practice will apply to Fast Track oppositions only filed on or after 1 October 2015 and intends to bring greater certainty to opposition proceedings and therefore encourage SMEs to protect their IP.

The cost cap has been introduced at £500, excluding official fees. This will be made up of £200 for filing a notice of opposition or filing a counterstatement and up to £300 for filing written submissions. Of course, since this is a cap, costs awards can be made for less, and it is envisaged that most awards will be for less. There is one safe guard that has been introduced relating to possible abuse of the cost cap. Thus, the cost cap will not apply where a party is found to have acted unreasonably when conducting proceedings. In such cases costs will be awarded at an appropriate level.

If you would like further information relating to the Fast Track opposition service at the UK IPO, please contact your usual Forresters' trade mark attorney who will be happy to advise you.

Kate Cruse

Forresters sponsor the PraxisUnico Conference

Forresters is sponsoring and exhibiting at the PraxisUnico conference, taking place in Stratford-Upon-Avon on 14-16 June 2016.

At the PraxisUnico conference professionals, expert in commercialising new ideas, meet to exchange ideas and experience.

Intellectual property is a key part of the commercialisation process. Forresters' Charlotte Teall and Charlotte Fox will be there to answer intellectual property questions.

Our Managing Partner, Lloyd Hoarton will be speaking at the event on Thursday 16 June 2016 discussing issues relating to 'IP beyond the Fringe'

For further information, please see *https://www.praxisunico.org.uk/training-events/conference*

Jon Gowshall recognised in 2016 IAM Patent 1000

Forresters' Life Sciences & Chemistry Partner, Jon Gowshall has been named in the IAM top 1000 patent practitioners in the world.

Jon is one of the UK attorneys recommended for patent prosecution. He is described as "smart and practical", whose abilities extend beyond prosecution to "very skilful representation in opposition".

IAM conducts extensive research to compile the Patent 1000 guide, holding detailed interviews with private practice lawyers and in-house counsel, to identify the leading players in the field.

For more information on IAM Patent 1000, visit here: *http://www.iam-media.com/patent1000/*

Promotions at Forresters

Mark became a Senior Associate in February 2016. Mark has first and second degree in Chemistry from University of Manchester. He spent a short time working as an analytical chemist in the pharmaceutical industry, before joining the patent profession in 2007. Mark joined Forresters in 2013.

Kate graduated from the University of Birmingham in Hispanic/Portuguese Studies. After qualifying as a trade mark attorney Kate worked for youth development charity Raleigh International as a Project Leader and Interpreter in Costa Rica and Nicaragua. Thereafter she experienced life in Central America for 6 years. During that time Kate worked for the British Embassy from their Costa Rican post in a number of roles varying from Director of UKTI to Regional Sustainable Operations officer. Kate joined Forresters in 2013.

The promotion of these talented patent and trade mark attorneys, further strengthens Forresters' ability to deliver exceptional service to our clients.

New starters at Forresters

We are pleased to announce the Life Sciences and Chemistry growing team with the addition of Trainee Patent Attorney, Kate Selwyn who joined our London office on 9 May 2016 and Trainee Patent Attorney, Ryan Mitchell who joins the team on 1 July 2016.

Forresters ranked amongst 'The World's Leading Trademark Professionals'

We are delighted to announce that we are ranked in the 2016 edition of World Trademark Review's 'The World's Leading Trademark Professionals'.

In the listing for UK trademark agencies, the guide praises us for being 'a dynamic European trademark and IP outfit that wins warm recommendations'. We 'don't stand on ceremony' and have 'an unfussy style that resonates with rights holders keen to make competitive progress'. Our advice is said to be 'clear-sighted and jargon-free', showing that our peers value and recognise our unique 'Clear Direction' ethos, which has been part and parcel of the firm for many years.

CIPA Patent Administrator Exam Success

We are delighted to announce that Sally Davies, Irene Rankin and Rachael Read from our Liverpool Office; Denise Betteridge and Angela Watts from our Birmingham Office, and Maria Heria from our London Office have recently passed the CIPA Patent Administrators' exam.

We are very proud of their achievements, which reflects the calibre of all who work at Forresters. We applaud their hard work and dedication.

Congratulations to all of them from the partners and staff!

Contact Us .....

Rutland House
148 Edmund Street
Birmingham B3 2JA
United Kingdom

birmingham@forresters.co.uk

T: +44 (0) 121 236 0484
F: +44 (0) 121 233 1064

Sherborne House
119–121 Cannon Street
London EC4N 5AT
United Kingdom

london@forresters.co.uk

T: +44 (0) 20 7283 8989
F: +44 (0) 20 7337 7100

Port of Liverpool Building
Pier Head
Liverpool L3 1AF
United Kingdom

merseyside@forresters.co.uk

T: +44 (0) 151 255 2180
F: +44 (0) 151 227 2748

Skygarden
Erika-Mann-Str. 11
80636 Munich
Germany

munich@forresters.co.uk

T: +49 (0) 89 2441 299 0
F: +49 (0) 89 2441 299 10

FORRESTERS

Clear direction

www.forresters.co.uk